4.10 OTHER VALUES

4.10.1 ALTERNATIVE A – PROPOSED CASINO AND HOTEL

NOISE

Overview

Alternative A has the potential to affect the noise environment in the immediate project vicinity due to the following noise sources:

- Construction activities associated with development would cause short-term increases in the noise environment.
- Increases in traffic volumes on the local roadway network would result in increased traffic noise levels along roadways that serve the project site.
- On-site traffic flow and parking lot activities associated with Alternative A would cause increases in the noise environment.
- Truck deliveries and loading dock activities associated with the ongoing operation of the casino would result in intermittent increases in noise in the immediate vicinity of loading dock areas.
- Mechanical equipment associated with the heating, ventilating, and air conditioning (HVAC) systems as well as refrigeration equipment associated with food cold storage could cause an increase in ambient noise levels in the immediate project vicinity.
- Operation of the power plant would result in increased noise levels.

Construction Noise

During the construction phase of Alternative A, noise from construction equipment would dominate the noise environment in the immediate area. Equipment used for construction would generate noise levels as indicated in **Table 4.10-1**. Maximum noise levels from different types of equipment under different operating conditions could range from 70 dBA to 90 dBA at a distance of 50 feet. The most important project-generated construction traffic noise source would be truck traffic associated with transport of heavy materials and equipment. The rural residences across 60th Street from the project site have a setback of approximately 100 feet and could experience a minor increase in noise due to construction of Alternative A. The mobile home park located at the northeast corner of Interstate-94 and 60th Street, southeast of the project site is located adjacent to 60th Street but across from a portion of the project site where development is located approximately 400 feet from the project boundary. This impact is significant; implementation of mitigation measures in **Section 5.2.9** and compliance with the adopted noise ordinance would ensure construction noise effects are less than significant.

TABLE 4.10-1
TYPICAL CONSTRUCTION NOISE LEVELS

Type of Equipment	Maximum Noise Level, dBA at 50 feet
Scrapers	88
Bulldozers	87
Heavy Trucks	88
Backhoe	85
Pneumatic Tools	85

SOURCE: AES, 2005

Off-site Traffic Noise

The existing DGP operates seven days per week and generates traffic on nearby roads. Alternative A would increase traffic as discussed in **Section 4.8**. Traffic along I-94 and 60th Street is the dominant source of noise for residents along 60th Street. The *FHWA Highway Traffic Noise Prediction Model* was used to project the traffic noise impact from the additional traffic flow on 60th Street. Assumptions used in this model include using "automobile" as the vehicle category (versus medium or heavy trucks), a constant road speed of 35 mph, level ground, no shielding of the source (worst-case projection), and a distance of 100 feet from the centerline. The noise level 100 feet south of the centerline of 60th Street (location of nearest residents) during the peak traffic period for Alternative A was predicted to be 59 dBA. Therefore, the peak noise increase attributable to the Alternative would be less than the Federally recommended 65 dB L_{dn} significance threshold. Thus, development of Alternative A would result in a less than significant increase in ambient noise level due to off-site traffic.

On-Site Traffic Flow and Parking Area Noise Effects

Alternative A includes a parking garage at the southern boundary of the project site setback 100 feet from 60th Street. A gated access drive would be located at the along 60th Street and provide access for service and emergency vehicles. A road located parallel to 60th Street would connect to the parking garage, warehouse and RV parking. Traffic along this road would be limited, as the majority of internal traffic would utilize the main site access off of Highway 158. The nearest sensitive receptors to the parking structure would be residences interspersed with agricultural land located across from the project site along 60th Street. The rural residences are set back 100 feet from 60th Street and sheltered by trees.

With the residential setback plus the parking garage setback, the nearest sensitive receptor would be located over 200 feet away from the noise source. It is typical for a passing car in a parking lot to produce a maximum noise level of 60 dB to 65 dB at a distance of 50 feet, which is comparable to the level of a raised voice. Parking garage surfaces can cause reflections of sound, so that noise from traffic and human activities could be magnified. However, the parking garage is located 100 feet from the project boundary and would produce less than 60 dB (average) at the

project boundary. Additionally, the combined setbacks of 200 feet and vegetation would further ensure that the parking garage would result in a less than significant increase to ambient noise levels at the rural residences. Mitigation measures in **Section 5** would further reduce noise effects from the parking garage.

Noise due to traffic in parking lots is limited by the low speeds, so that the noise from this source is not usually expected to be significant. Human activity in parking lots that can produce noise includes talking, yelling, and opening and closing of car doors and trunk lids. The nearest surface parking would be located approximately 400 feet from the mobile home park at the southwestern boundary of the project site. Noise from the surface parking would be less than the 70 dB limit, and would result in a less than significant impact.

The noise level due to idling modern diesel buses averages approximately 65 dBA at 50 feet. The nearest tour buses would be parked in the RV parking to the southeast of the project site, more than 200 feet away from the nearest residence. Idling tour buses would result in noise levels at the project boundary of less than 65 dB and would be considered a less than significant impact. Implementation of mitigation measures in **Section 5.2.9** would ensure bus noise effects are further reduced.

Truck Delivery / Loading Dock Noise Effects

Loading dock areas can be significant noise sources due primarily to the noise produced by passing trucks. Although the trucks would be moving at low speeds, the engine noise could be significant (typically 70 dB to 75 dB at 50 feet), and the number and time of day of truck deliveries could affect the reactions of nearby noise sensitive receivers. Loading docks would be at the rear of the casino building, and would be located more than 600 feet from the nearest noise sensitive use. Maximum noise levels due to truck movements at the loading docks would be in the range of 48 to 53 dBA. This noise exposure would be less than significant. However, at some locations, loading dock noise would be audible during the quietest hours of the night, and could be significant due to an increase in ambient noise levels during those hours. Implementation of mitigation measures in **Section 5** would ensure loading dock noise effects are less than significant.

HVAC Mechanical Equipment Noise Effects

The casino and hotel buildings would be equipped with HVAC units, which could be significant noise sources. The proposed casino and hotel are situated at least 500 feet from the southern project site boundary, approximately 600 feet from the nearest sensitive receptor. Thus, a less than significant effect to the nearest sensitive receptors would result from fans and other HVAC equipment.

Power Plant Noise Effects

In Alternative A, the power plant building would be located approximately 650 feet from the nearest sensitive uses, and would be shielded by the warehouse building to the south. A less than significant effect would result.

Airport Noise Effects

The Proposed Project is located within the Kenosha Airport Overlay Districts and has agreed to the District overlay limitations for development as part of the IGA. The central portion of the project site currently includes an area designated by the zoning ordinance as "Air-3 District," which is classified as an approach zone. Development is limited to all uses permitted under the existing zoning district and all proposed development should provide a minimum of five decibels extra noise reduction. Development will occur in the "Air-3 District" and the "Air-4 District". According to the Kenosha zoning ordinance (§ 13), noise exposure within the Air-3 District and Air-4 District would be less than 65 DNL due to the operation of aircraft. Therefore, a less than significant effect would result from proximity to the Kenosha Airport.

HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Existing Sources

There is not any reportable hazardous materials contamination on the project site. There are not any adjacent sites with hazardous materials involvement that will affect the planned uses of the project site. Therefore, implementation of Alternative A would not cause the environment or public to be affected by hazardous materials.

Construction

During grading and construction the use of hazardous materials would include substances such as gasoline, diesel fuel, motor oil, hydraulic fluid, solvents, cleaners, sealants, welding flux, various lubricants, paint, and paint thinner. These materials would be used for the operation and maintenance of equipment, and directly in the construction of the facilities. Regular fueling and oiling of construction equipment would be performed. To reduce the potential for accidental releases, fuel, oil, and hydraulic fluids would be transferred directly from a service truck to construction equipment tanks and would not otherwise be stored onsite. Paint, thinner, solvents, cleaners, sealants, and lubricants used during construction would be stored in a locked utility building, handled per the manufacturers' directions, and replenished as needed.

The most likely possible incidents involving hazardous materials would involve the dripping of fuels, oil, and grease from construction equipment, and during handling and transfer from one container to another. The small quantities of fuel, oil, and grease that may drip would have low relative toxicity and concentrations. Typical construction management practices limit and often eliminate the effect of such accidental releases. An accident involving a service or refueling truck

would present the worst-case scenario for the release of hazardous materials. Depending on the relative hazard of the hazardous material, if a spill were to occur of significant quantity, the accidental release could pose both a hazard to construction employees as well as the environment. This effect is potentially significant.

Mitigation has been included within **Section 5.0** to address construction-related hazardous materials effects.

Operation

The U.S. Department of Labor Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) regulations include provisions that require facilities to document the potential risk associated with the storage, use, and handling of toxic and flammable substances. OSHA regulations are codified in 29 CFR Parts 70-71, 1990-1990, 2200-2205, and 2400.

During operation of the Alternative A facilities, the majority of waste produced would be non-hazardous. Currently, small quantities of hazardous materials that are generated at the DGP include motor oil, hydraulic fluid, solvents, cleaners, lubricants, paint, and paint thinner. These materials would be generated from the use and maintenance of the casino, emergency generators, and other project facilities. The amount and type of hazardous materials that would be generated are common to commercial sites and do not pose unusual storage, handling or disposal issues.

An existing 800-gallon diesel UST is present on the project site. The UST is currently used to run the emergency generator for the DGP clubhouse. The UST would remain in place and would be used for the casino. The UST is equipped with a double wall with integrated leak detection system. If a leak were to occur within the inner tank, the outer tank would contain the leak, while a pressure sensor would signal the leak on the indicator panel of the generator unit. Security personnel would monitor the generator units. Security personnel would be on site at all times and would be trained in emergency response procedures. The generator is located near the entrance to the DGP clubhouse and is easily accessed by maintenance and emergency personnel.

Based upon the amount and type of hazardous materials that would be stored, used, and generated during operation of Alternative A, effects to the environment or public are considered to be less than significant.

VISUAL RESOURCES

The Regional Viewshed

In **Section 3.10.3**, the regional viewshed is categorized into *vistas* according to analytical criteria expressing the strength of the viewing experience. Impacts to these vistas resulting from the buildout of Alternative A are identified below. It should be noted that under existing land use plans, development in the region has been anticipated, and that the visibility of buildings would not be considered a significant impact.

Vista A

For southbound commuters on I-94, the proposed facilities would come into view on the left quarter at a quarter mile distance from Highway 158, for approximately one minute. As discussed in **Section 3.8.3**, a vista from directly west of the DGP property is unattainable due to rolling terrain, trees and development. The elevation of I-94 restricts the attainment of view from west of the highway. No significant impacts would occur.

Vista B

Eastbound and westbound travelers along 60th Street and residential viewers along 60th Street and in the recently constructed *River Crossings* housing development would experience view of the southern portion of the Proposed Project in Vista B. This would primarily entail the parking structure and warehouse features on the east side of the property. Mitigation is presented in Section 5 to address this impact.

Vista C

Commuter traffic would be exposed to the eastern side of the Proposed Project along 104th Avenue and along the segment of 60th Street east of 104th Avenue. This would primarily entail the eastern walls of the warehouses on the east side of the development, and the east side of the parking structure. This is an insignificant impact and no mitigation is required.

Vista D

Along the westbound approach up to lateral view, additional buildings would be perceptible, though obscured by the profile of the existing DGP Clubhouse. This is an insignificant impact and no mitigation is required.

Lighting and Glare

Lighting and glare impacts could occur as a result of light poles and signage, impacting residential areas to the south of the project site. Therefore, mitigation is specified in **Section 5**.

4.10.2 ALTERNATIVE B – REDUCED INTENSITY ALTERNATIVE

NOISE

The addition of casino facilities in the clubhouse under Alternative B would result in minor effects to the noise environment. Most construction activity under Alternative B would occur indoors, and would therefore not cause significant impacts. Additional trip generation would not be significant. Additional delivery and HVAC noises would be minimal. No mitigation is necessary.

HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Existing Sources

As discussed under Alternative A there is no reportable hazardous materials contamination on the project site. There are no adjacent sites with hazardous materials involvement that will affect the surface and/or subsurface conditions on the project site. Therefore, implementation of Alternative B would not cause the environment or public to be affected by hazardous materials currently in the project area. Refer to **Section 3.10.2** for existing conditions as it pertains to hazardous materials on or near the project site.

Construction

Impacts from the use of hazardous materials during construction will be less than significant. Please refer to the hazardous materials discussion under Alternative A in **Section 4.10.1** for more detailed information. Mitigation has been included within **Section 5.0** to reduce the significance of the hazardous materials effects.

Operation

Small quantities of hazardous materials generated during the operation of Alternative B are the same as discussed under Alternative A and are considered less than significant. Please refer to **Section 4.10.1** for more detailed information.

VISUAL RESOURCES

Since no external construction is planned under Alternative B, no impacts to visual resources are anticipated.

4.10.3 ALTERNATIVE C – KESHENA SITE ALTERNATIVE

NOISE

The overview and significance criteria presented in the Alternative A apply to the noise discussion for Alternative C.

Noise Effects

Sensitive receptors are located over ½ mile from the Keshena site. The mixed deciduous and conifer forest surrounding the project site would effectively block any noise generated from the project site. Therefore, noise impacts to the closest sensitive receptors would result in a less than significant impact. Implementation of mitigation measures, as discussed in **Section 5**, would further reduce any noise generated at the Keshena site.

HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Existing Sources

There is no reportable hazardous materials contamination on the Keshena site. Therefore, implementation of Alternative C would not cause the environment or public to be affected by hazardous materials currently in the project area.

Construction

Alternative C (as discussed in **Section 2.0**) would involve demolishing most of the current casino, and replacing it with larger, permanent structures. Impacts from the use of hazardous materials during construction will be less than significant. Please refer to the hazardous materials discussion under Alternative A in **Section 4.10.1** for more detailed information. Mitigation has been included within **Section 5.0** to reduce the significance of the hazardous materials effects.

Operation

Under the operation of Alternative C the amount and type of hazardous materials that would be generated are common to commercial sites and do not pose unusual storage, handling or disposal issues. Hazardous materials that would be stored, used, and generated during operation of Alternative C are the same as those discussed for Alternative A. Impacts to the environment or public are considered to be less than significant.

VISUAL RESOURCES

Impacts to visual resources under Alternative C would be localized and isolated from view by forested areas. Therefore, no significant impact is expected to occur under Alternative C.

4.10.4 ALTERNATIVE D – HOTEL-CONFERENCE CENTER AND RECREATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

NOISE

Noise from construction is considered a significant impact and mitigation is required. Alternative D would also generate noise from traffic, delivery vehicles, and HVAC equipment. For more detailed information please see the discussion under Alternative A. Mitigation for noise is specified in **Section 5**.

HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Existing Sources

As discussed under Alternative A there is no reportable hazardous materials contamination on the project site. Adjacent sites with hazardous materials involvement are not likely to affect the surface and/or subsurface conditions on the project site. Therefore, implementation of Alternative D would not cause the environment or public to be affected by hazardous materials

currently in the project area. Refer to **Section 3.10.2** for existing conditions as it pertains to hazardous materials on or near the project site.

Construction

Impacts from the use of hazardous materials during construction are potentially significant. Please refer to the hazardous materials discussion in **Section 4.10.1** for more detail. Mitigation has been included within **Section 5.0** to reduce the significance of the hazardous materials effects.

Operation

Under the operation of Alternative D the amount and type of hazardous materials that would be generated are common to commercial sites and do not pose unusual storage, handling or disposal issues. Hazardous materials that would be stored, used, and generated during operation of Alternative C are the same as those discussed for Alternative A. Impacts to the environment or public are considered to be less than significant.

VISUAL RESOURCES

Visual impacts associated with Vistas A, C, and D are less than significant due to natural features and existing development around the project site. Impacts associated with Vista D could result in significant impacts due to lighting and glare. For more detailed information please see the discussion of visual resources for Alternative A as the building footprints and heights are similar for Alternative D. Mitigation is specified in **Section 5**.

4.10.5 ALTERNATIVE E – NO ACTION

NOISE

The No Action Alternative would result in a continuation of existing uses on the Kenosha and Keshena sites. As such, the No Action Alternative would not increase the ambient noise environment through construction or operation of facilities. No effect would result under the No Action Alternative.

HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

Existing uses on the project site would continue under the No Action Alternative. No effects to hazardous materials would result from the No Action Alternative.

VISUAL RESOURCES

Under the No Action Alternative, no impacts to visual resources would occur. Changes in the regional viewshed would occur consistent with local jurisdictional land use plans if any future development were to occur.